DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 429 964 SP 038 466

AUTHOR Ganser, Tom
TITLE Reconsidering the Relevance of Veenman's (1984) Meta-Analysis of the Perceived Problems of Beginning Teachers.
PUB DATE 1999-04-00
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, April 19-23, 1999).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers; *Cooperating Teachers; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Mentors; *Meta Analysis; Preservice Teacher Education; *Teacher Attitudes; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS Wisconsin

ABSTRACT

This study surveyed three groups of teachers to investigate their perceptions of problems faced by beginning teachers. The study reexamined the usefulness of Veenman's (1984) meta-analysis of the perceived problems of beginning teachers. Participants were Wisconsin beginning teachers, experienced urban teachers, and cooperating teachers. The participants received mailed surveys that investigated the extent to which they believed each of several areas were problems for beginning teachers. Participants also wrote in other comments and provided demographic information. Data analysis indicated that far more experienced cooperating teachers viewed beginning teachers as having more problems than did beginning teachers or teachers near the end of their beginning career stages. Wisconsin teachers and urban teachers ranked lack of spare time, burden of clerical work, and heavy teaching loads as the three greatest problems. All of those problems focused on limited time, whereas the three greatest perceived problems in Veenman's study focused on students (discipline, motivation, and individual differences.) The correlation between respondents' rank order of perceived problems and Veenman's rank order was negligible or negative for Wisconsin teachers and urban teachers, and slightly positive for cooperating teachers. This study indicates that although Veenman's work is important, it is not current and requires careful treatment. Ten tables present relevant data. (Contains 20 references.) (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 429 964

Reconsidering the Relevance of Veenman's (1984) Meta-Analysis of the Perceived Problems of Beginning Teachers

Tom Ganser

University of Wisconsin-Whitewater

This paper was prepared for presentation at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Session 48.02), Montreal, Canada, April 23, 1999.

Reactions to this paper are invited.

Tom Ganser, Director
Office of Field Experiences
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
800 West Main Street
Whitewater, Wisconsin, 53190
U.S.A.
Office: (414) 472-1123
Fax: (414) 472-5716
E-mail: gansert@uwwvax.uww.edu

SP038466

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

T. Ganser

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Reconsidering the Relevance of Veenman's (1984) Meta-analysis of Perceived Problems of Beginning Teachers

Formal mentor programs and other types of assistance for beginning teachers have increased dramatically since their emergence in the early 1970s (Darling-Hammond & Sclan, 1996; Furtwenger, 1995; U. S. Department of Education, 1998b, 1999). Mentor programs are likely to expand over the next decade due to three factors that will result in a large influx of beginning teachers: (1) an increasing number of children entering American schools (U.S. Department of Education, 1998a), (2) a growing proportion of teachers who will be retiring (sometimes encouraged by attractive early retirement packages), and (3) efforts to reduce class enrollments at both the national and state level, including 42 states that have class-size reduction legislation on their agendas for this session of their state legislatures (Imig, 1999).

The increased need for mentoring is occurring simultaneously with a broad reconceptualization of how best to promote the professional development of teachers. No longer are stand alone, quick fix workshops viewed as adequate. Today's staff development activities for teachers aim to create schools as learning communities, not only for the pupils whom they serve but also for the professionals working in them (National Commission on Teaching & America's Future, 1996; National Foundation for the Improvement of Education, 1996; Sparks & Hirsch, 1997). Within this context, mentoring is viewed as contributing to the professional development of teachers who serve as mentors as well as to the development of new teachers.

The success of mentoring depends largely on veteran teachers who work closely with beginning teachers as their mentors. Viewing mentoring as a new professional role for teachers warrants specialized training and on-going support. Thorough reviews of research on beginning teachers and teacher induction are available to those responsible for preparing teachers to serve as mentors, including Gold (1996), Huling-Austin (1990),

and Zeichner and Gore (1990).

The seminal works of several researchers, including Fuller and Bown (1975), Hoy (1969), and Lacey (1975), are typically viewed as central to the literature on teacher development and teacher induction. In particular, Veenman's (1984) meta-analysis of studies about the perceived problems of beginning teachers is very often used as the basis for preparing mentors to understand and anticipate the needs of beginning teachers so that they can offer assistance and intervene in advance of crisis situations. However, it seem reasonable in 1999 to reconsider the usefulness of Veenman's findings today since they are based on studies of beginning teachers that were published between 1961 and 1983. Although mentoring programs now enjoy a history of nearly thirty years, there is also an increasing danger that mentor trainers today may be trapped by assumptions about beginning teachers, such as those found in Veenman's article, that may be out-dated and possibly inaccurate today.

Method

Participants

This study is based on surveys of three groups of teachers:

(1) **Wisconsin teachers.** Wisconsin teachers with approximately one to three years of teaching experience working in 15 school districts with enrollments ranging from 1,050 to about 13,000,

(2) **Urban teachers.** Teachers with approximately four to five years of teaching experience employed in a urban district on the east coast of the United States with an enrollment of approximately 100,000 students.

(3) **UW-W cooperating teachers.** Teachers serving as cooperating teachers for student teachers and interns enrolled at the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, a comprehensive, regional public university located in

southeastern Wisconsin with an enrollment of about 10,500 students.

Demographic characteristics and additional information about the

---

Insert Table 1 and Table 2 about here.

Wisconsin and Urban teachers is provided in Table 1, and about the UW-W cooperating teachers in Table 2.

Procedure

Surveys were mailed to the Wisconsin teachers in March 1998 based on lists provided by school districts. A second survey was also sent in May 1998 to the teachers who did not respond to the first survey. Surveys were mailed to Urban teachers in April 1998 based on a list provided by the district.

Each respondent was provided with one of three versions of an unranked and randomly arranged list of the 24 perceived problems of beginning teachers as identified by Veenman (1984) in

---

Insert Table 3 about here.

Table II, using the identical language as Veenman's. Using a four-point Likert-type scale, respondents were asked to indicate to what extent they believed each of the areas listed may have been a major problem (4 points), problem (3 points), minor problem (2 point), or not a problem (1 point) for them in their teaching.

Respondents were also provided with space to list other problems in response to the prompt, "In the space below, briefly describe up to three problem areas for you in your teaching which are missing from the above list." Respondents were asked to provide information about their age, gender, race, college degrees, teaching assignment, and years of teaching experience.

UW-W cooperating teachers for early field experience students and student teachers, were also surveyed. As part of a

mailing for an annual banquet, each cooperating teacher was asked to complete one of same three versions of an unranked and randomly arranged list of the 24 perceived problems of beginning teachers as the Wisconsin and Urban teachers. Using a four-point Likert-type scale, respondents were asked to indicate to what extent they believed each of the areas listed may be a major problem (4 points), problem (3 points), minor problem (2 point), or not a problem (1 point) for a beginning teacher (not for themselves).

The response rate was 52.4 percent (186 usable surveys out of 355 surveys) for the Wisconsin teachers, 17.6 percent (125 usable surveys out of 709) for the Urban teachers, and 70.0 percent (287 usable surveys out of 410) for the UW-W cooperating teachers. With respect to the open-ended item, 196 additions were provided by the Wisconsin teachers and 189 by the Urban teachers.

Survey data were analyzed using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS). The responses to the open-ended item (i.e., listing additional problem areas) were analyzed for emergent categories (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984).

Results

Quantitative data

The mean, standard deviation, and rank order for each of the 24 Veenman (1984) perceived problems for the Wisconsin and Urban teachers, and the UW-W cooperating teachers are displayed in Table 4. In addition, the overall mean for the 24 perceived

---

Insert Table 4 about here.

---

problems is provided for the Wisconsin teachers (M = 1.75, SD = 0.37), the Urban teachers (M = 1.94, SD = 0.43), and the UW-W cooperating teachers (M = 2.20, SD = 0.49).

Table 5 displays a summary of the rank order for the 24 perceived problems as it appears in Veenman (1984), the Wisconsin teachers, the Urban teachers, and the UW-W cooperating teachers.

In addition, Table 6 displays the rank order correlations for

---

Insert Table 5 and Table 6 about here.

Veenman and the three groups of teachers. As shown in Table 5, the rank order correlation between the Wisconsin teachers and Veenman is negligible at 0.040, whereas the rank order correlation between the Urban teachers and Veenman is slightly negative, at -0.164. In addition, the correlation between the Wisconsin teachers and the Urban teachers is moderately strong, at 0.895.

Table 7 displays a comparison of the rank order, means, and

Insert Table 7 and Table 8 about here.

---

standard deviations for Wisconsin teachers by Type (regular education or special education), including statistically significant differences in means for specific problems. Table 8 displays corresponding information for Wisconsin teachers by Level (elementary or middle/high school). Tables 7 and 8 also provide the grand mean and standard deviation

---

Insert Table 9 and Table 10 about here.

---

for all 24 perceived problems. Corresponding information for Urban teachers is provided in Table 9 (Urban teachers by Type) and in Table 10 (Urban teachers by Level).

Qualitative data

In many instances, the comments provided by the Wisconsin and Urban teachers for the open-ended item ("In the space below, briefly describe up to three problem areas for you in your teaching which are missing from the above list") provided examples of problems included among the twenty-four items respondents were asked to rate. For example, both the Wisconsin teachers and the Urban teachers gave numerous examples of time

limitations which was often linked to general work demands, additional duties and meeting to attend, and "paperwork." However, some patterns emerged which are worth noting.

Among the Wisconsin teachers, more comments focused on problematic relationships with adults, including staff, administrators, and parents, than on any other topic. Several special education teachers included roles and relationships with aides as troubling. Another group of comments focused on students, particularly with respect to special needs, adjusting learning levels, and motivation in general. Two other groups of added problems highlighted (1) school and district culture, including a lack of mentoring and support, and union and "political" issues, and (2) limited opportunities for professional development support. As an example of the latter problem area, several respondents emphasized a lack of support in learning about budgets and budget-related issues. Limited resources was also a frequently cited problem area, especially with respect to computer and communications technology.

Like those of the Wisconsin teachers, the Urban teachers often cited responsibilities (non-academic duties, committee assignments, covering classes for other teachers) as taking away from time for planning lessons. There were also more comments about lack of parental support and about inconsistent classroom and school discipline policies among the Urban teachers in comparison to the Wisconsin teachers. Three topics emerged among the Urban teachers that were not mentioned by the Wisconsin teachers for the most part. One set of problems focused on rapid change in the school district in terms of goals and objectives, curriculum, and job responsibilities. A second set stressed unclear or unrealistic expectations by administration. Finally, a third group of problems for the Urban teachers centered on testing, assessment, and differentiation.

Discussion

This study is based on three quite different groups of teachers, as indicated in Table 2 and Table 3. The Wisconsin

beginning teachers are clearly at the start of their career, having very little teaching experience (M = 2.00 years, SD = 1.86). They also work in small school districts for the most part. With almost 4 ½ years of teaching experience on average (M = 4.46 years, SD = 0.53), many of the Urban teachers are at the end of the beginning stages of their career and they work in one of the larger school districts in the United States. The UW-W cooperating teachers have far more experience (M = 18.72 years, SD = 8.78) than either of the other two groups and have had considerable contact with prospective teachers, having served as cooperating teacher for over eight students (M = 8.42, SD = 9.79) on average. Therefore, making comparisons among these three groups and comparing their perceptions of beginning teacher problems to the findings of Veenman (1984) must be approached cautiously. Still, the widespread use of Veenman's findings today warrants exploring these comparisons.

Turning to Table 4, it is noteworthy that the overall mean for the 24 perceived problems is less for the Wisconsin teachers (M = 1.75, SD = 0.37) than it is for the Urban teachers (M = 1.94, SD = 0.43). It is also interesting to note that the UW-W Cooperating Teachers rate the problems of beginning teachers higher yet (M= 2.20, SD = 0.49). The UW-W cooperating teachers' rating may be influenced by their work with student teachers and interns, and possibly by their own experiences as beginning teachers. Nevertheless, the implication is that the far more experienced cooperating teachers view beginning teachers as having more problems than do beginning teachers or teachers near the end of their beginning career stages. Importantly, it is from among this group of cooperating teachers that mentors are most likely to be drawn.

In mentor training, the focus on Veenman's (1984) findings tends to be on the rank order of perceived problems as they appear in Table II in the original article, and usually on the rank order of all 91 studies combined without regard to differentiation by level (elementary level, secondary level,

elementary and secondary level) as provided by Veenman. As shown in Table 5 and confirmed in Table 6, there is considerable variation in the rank order for the 24 perceived problems as rated by the Wisconsin and Urban teachers, and the UW-Whitewater cooperating teachers, especially in comparison to the rank order provided by Veenman.

It is important to emphasize that the three greatest perceived problems for the Wisconsin and the Urban teachers (1.0, V22, Lack of spare time; 2.0, V16, Burden of clerical work; 3.0, V9, Heavy teaching load resulting in insufficient preparation time) are ranked far lower in Veenman's study, 22.0, 16.0, and 9.0, respectively. Moreover, the three greatest problems for the Wisconsin and Urban teachers focus on limited time, whereas the three greatest perceived problems in Veenman's study focus on students (1.0, V1, Classroom discipline; 2.0, V2, Motivating students; 3.0, V3, dealing with individual difference).

The correlation between the respondents' rank order of perceived problems and Veenman's (1984) is negligible for the Wisconsin teachers (0.040) and negative for the Urban teachers (-0.164), as displayed in Table 6. The relatively strong positive correlation between the Wisconsin teachers and the Urban teachers (0.895) suggests that differences in years of teaching experience and school district are not as important as might be assumed. Finally, the slightly positive correlation between the UW-W cooperating teachers' and Veenman's (0.331) ranking may be related to the fact that the cooperating teachers were beginning teachers about the time that many of the studies reported by Veenman were conducted.

Mentoring and mentoring programs have never been more visible than today. In 1998 65 percent of full-time public school teachers with three or fewer years of teaching experience indicated participation in a formal induction program when they first began teaching, compared to 14 percent of teachers with 20 or more years of teaching experience (U. S. Department of Education, 1999). The trend is very likely to continue,

especially as mentoring programs are mandated. In Wisconsin, for example, a proposal is currently moving forward that creates a three-tier teacher licensing structure, including the category of "Initial Educator" that requires the support of a mentor during the first year of employment for beginning teachers, administrators, and school support staff such as guidance counselors, social workers, and school psychologists (Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 1999).

As mentoring programs move into the 21st century, there is the danger that they will be based on "first generation" approaches to mentoring that originated twenty or more years ago whose relevancy is questionable (Ganser, 1999). "Second generation" mentoring is based on the recognition that the real and perceived needs of beginning teachers can and do change over time. Accordingly, effective mentoring programs take into account the fact that in mentoring, as in most other forms of professional and staff development, one size does not fit all. This is reflected in the differences between how Wisconsin and Urban beginning teachers ranked the perceived problems when sorted by type (regular education or special education) and level (elementary school and middle/high school), as displayed in Tables 7, 8, 9, and 10.

Certainly there are significant limitations in reaching general conclusions, based on information gathered at any point in time, about how beginning teachers view their problems, especially during their first few years of work (Stroot, Fowlkes, Langholz, Paxton, Stedman, Steffes, & Valtman, 1999). However, assuming quickly that research on beginning teachers that is now twenty or thirty years old is still as relevant today as it was then is also dangerous. Although Veenman's (1984) important work will remain part of the foundation for research on beginning teachers and for mentor training with good reason, it now requires more careful treatment.

References

Darling-Hammond, L., & Sclan, E. M. (1996). Who teachers and why: Dilemmas of building a profession for the twenty-first century. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), Handbook of research on teacher education (2nd ed.) (pp. 67-101). New York: Macmillan.

Fuller, F. F., & Bown, O. H. (1975). Becoming a teacher. In K. Ryan (Ed.), Teacher Education (74th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, pp. 25-52). Chicago: University of Chicago.

Furtwengler, C. B. (1995). Beginning teacher programs: Analysis of state actions during the reform era. Education Policy Analysis, 3(3). Available HTTP: http://olam.ed.asu.edu/epaa/

Ganser, T. (1999, February 21). What the research says about teacher mentoring: Moving from first to second generation mentoring programs. Presentation at the Teacher Mentoring Symposium, National Foundation for the Improvement of Education, Los Angeles, CA.

Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative research design. New York: Academic Press.

Gold, Y. (1996). Beginning teacher support: Attrition, mentoring, and induction. In J. Sikula, T. J., Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), Handbook of research on teacher education (2nd ed.), pp. 548-594. New York: Macmillan.

Hoy, W. K. (1969). Pupil control ideology and organizational socialization: A further examination of the influence of experience on the beginning teacher. School Review, 77, 257-265.

Huling-Austin, L. (1990). Teacher induction programs and internships. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 535-548). New York: Macmillan.

Imig, D. G. (1999, March 25). Connecting teaching and learning. Keynote address at the spring meeting of the Wisconsin Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

Lacey, C. (1977). The socialization of teachers. London:

Methuen.

National Commission on Teaching & America's Future. (1996). What matters most: Teaching for America's future. Woodbridge, VA: Author.

National Foundation for the Improvement of Education. (1996). Teachers take charge of their learning: Transforming professional development for student success. Washington, DC: Author.

Sparks, D., & Hirsh, S. (1997). A new vision for staff development. Oxford, Ohio: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Staff Development Council.

Stroot, S. A., Fowlkes, J., Langholz, J, Paxton, S., Stedman, P., Steffes, L., Valtman, A. (1999). Impact of a collaborative peer assistance and review model on entry-year teachers in a large urban school district. Journal of Teacher Education, 60(1), 27-41.

United States Department of Education. National Center for Educational Statistics. (1998a). Pocket Projections: Projections of Educational Statistics to 2008. NCES 98-017. Washington, D.C.: author.

United States Department of Education. Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (1998b). Toward better teaching: Professional development in 1993-94. NCES 98-230. Washington, D. C.: author.

United States Department of Education. National Center for Educational Statistics. (1999). Teacher quality: A report on the preparation and qualifications of public school teachers. NCES 1999-080. Washington, DC: author.

Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. Review of Educational Research, 54(2), 143-178.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. (1999). Draft of Revised Chapter PI 3 - Wisconsin Administrative Code. Available HTTP: http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dlsis/tel/newrules.html

Zeichner, K. M., & Gore, J. M. (1990). Teacher socialization. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 329-348). New York: Macmillan.

Table 1 Wisconsin and Urban teachers

	Wisconsin		Urban	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Gender				
Male	50	26.9	18	14.4
Female	136	73.1	107	85.4
Race				
White	183	98.4	119	95.2
Not white	3	1.6	6	4.8
Degree				
BA/BS	172	93.0	69	55.2
MA/MS	13	7.0	56	44.8
Level				
Elementary	68	38.6	66	53.7
Middle/High	108	61.4	57	46.3
Type				
Regular Education	157	84.4	110	88.7
Special Education	29	15.6	14	11.3
Survey				
Form A	63	33.9	40	32.0
Form B	62	33.3	42	33.6
Form C	61	32.8	43	34.4
Mean age in years, SD	28.72	6.41	31.21	7.10
Mean teaching experience in years, SD	2.00	1.86	4.46	0.53

Table 2 UW-W Cooperating Teachers

	N	Percent
Gender		
Male	48	17.3
Female	230	82.7
Level		
Preschool	19	6.7
Elementary	138	48.8
Secondary	117	41.3
Other	9	3.2
Type		
Regular Education	175	66.0
Special Education	46	17.4
Inclusion	8	3.0
Other	36	13.6
Survey		
Form A	102	35.7
Form B	94	32.9
Form C	90	31.5

Completion of course or seminar in supervising t student teachers, percent		Yes =	193	73.4%
		No =	70	26.6%
Mean teaching experience in years, SD	18.72	8.78		
Number of students served, SD	8.42	9.79		

Table 3 Veenman's Table II (Veenman, 1984)

No.	Rank ord*	Problems	Frq.	Med.	Q
V1	1.0	Classroom discipline	77	13.0	1.4
V2	2.0	Motivating students	48	12.8	1.9
V3	3.0	Dealing with individual differences	43	13.0	1.5
V4	4.5	Assessing students' work	31	10.0	2.0
V5	4.5	Relations with parents	31	9.0	3.5
V6	6.5	Organization of class work	27	12.5	2.8
V7	6.5	Insufficient materials and supplies	27	11.0	2.5
V8	8.0	Dealing with problems of individual students	26	12.5	1.5
V9	9.0	Heavy teaching load resulting in insufficient prep. time	25	12.0	2.3
V10	10.0	Relations with colleagues	24	8.0	3.0
V11	11.0	Planning of lessons and schooldays	22	11.8	2.6
V12	12.0	Effective use of different teaching methods	20	12.0	3.6
V13	13.0	Awareness of school policies and rules	19	11.0	3.0
V14	14.0	Determining learning level of students	16	10.5	2.8
V15	16.0	Knowledge of subject matter	15	11.0	1.5
V16	16.0	Burden of clerical work	15	9.0	1.8
V17	16.0	Relations with principals/administrators	15	9.0	3.0
V18	18.0	Inadequate school equipment	14	11.0	2.6
V19	19.0	Dealing with slow learners	13	12.0	1.4
V20	20.0	Dealing with students of different cultures and deprived backgrounds	12	9.0	2.6
V21	21.0	Effective use of textbooks and curriculum guides	11	8.9	3.5
V22	22.0	Lack of spare time	10	11.0	2.3
V23	23.0	Inadequate guidance and support	9	8.0	2.5
V24	24.0	Large class size	8	9.5	2.4

*The rank order is based on the number of ti9mes a problem was mentioned in the sampled studies (see column 1 frq = "frequency"). The median is based on the number of scores which could range per study from 15 (for problems ranked number 1) to 1 (for problems ranked number 15). Med. = median, Q = semi-interquartile. (Veenman, 1984)

Table 4 Wisconsin teachers, Urban teachers, UW-W cooperating teachers

No.	Problems	Wis Rank	Wis N	Wis Mean	Wis SD	Urb Rank	Urb N	Urb Mean	Urb SD	UW-W Rank	UW-W N	UW-W Mean	UW-W SD
V1	Classroom discipline	4.0	184	2.01	0.81	7.0	125	2.07	0.93	3.0	283	2.40	1.00
V2	Motivating students	7.0	185	1.92	0.85	10.0	125	2.02	0.89	1.0	286	2.49	0.99
V3	Dealing with indiv diff	12.0	183	1.73	0.74	14.5	125	1.74	0.82	5.0	286	2.37	0.92
V4	Assessing students' work	15.5	185	1.61	0.71	17.0	125	1.62	0.76	9.0	283	2.27	0.86
V5	Relations with parents	20.0	186	1.45	0.68	16.0	125	1.63	0.67	17.0	283	2.15	0.80
V6	Organization of class work	17.0	186	1.59	0.68	20.0	125	1.54	0.65	18.0	285	2.13	0.85
V7	Insufficient materials & supplies	6.0	185	1.99	0.89	6.0	124	2.23	1.06	20.0	284	2.02	0.83
V8	Dealing w/ probs ind students	8.0	185	1.90	0.77	8.0	124	2.06	0.83	9.0	285	2.27	0.90
V9	Teaching load, insuff prep time	3.0	186	2.27	1.04	3.0	125	2.53	1.03	13.0	285	2.26	0.90
V10	Relations with colleagues	21.5	186	1.33	0.62	23.5	125	1.37	0.64	11.5	286	2.24	0.91
V11	Planning of lessons & schooldays	15.5	185	1.61	0.77	13.0	123	1.77	0.80	2.0	282	2.48	0.97
V12	Effective use of diff tch methods	18.5	186	1.54	0.61	19.0	124	1.55	0.62	15.0	285	2.21	0.91
V13	Awareness of sch policies & rules	14.0	186	1.68	0.71	22.0	125	1.41	0.64	11.5	284	2.24	0.89
V14	Determining learning level of stu	13.0	186	1.72	0.68	14.5	125	1.74	0.77	23.0	283	1.83	0.76
V15	Knowledge of subject matter	21.5	186	1.33	0.58	23.5	125	1.37	0.63	14.0	285	2.22	0.84
V16	Burden of clerical work	2.0	186	2.35	1.03	2.0	125	2.92	0.94	4.0	284	2.39	0.92
V17	Relations with principals/admin	24.0	185	1.25	0.59	21.0	125	1.50	0.75	21.0	284	1.98	0.78
V18	Inadequate school equipment	9.0	186	1.88	0.84	5.0	125	2.24	0.98	6.0	285	2.36	0.88
V19	Dealing w/slow learners	10.0	185	1.75	0.75	9.0	125	2.04	0.87	24.0	285	1.78	0.81
V20	Deal w/stu diff cult, deprvd bcgd	23.0	186	1.23	0.54	18.0	125	1.57	0.77	19.0	285	2.03	0.82
V21	Effective use txtbks, curr guides	11.0	185	1.74	0.81	12.0	124	1.95	0.98	22.0	285	1.92	0.80
V22	Lack of spare time	1.0	185	2.63	1.03	1.0	125	3.14	0.99	7.0	282	2.33	0.96
V23	Inadequate guidance & support	18.5	185	1.54	0.75	11.0	125	2.00	0.94	16.0	285	2.20	0.88
V24	Large class size	5.0	185	2.00	0.89	4.0	125	2.45	1.09	9.0	285	2.27	0.93
GM	Grand mean V1 to V24		186	1.75	0.37		125	1.94	0.43		286	2.20	0.49

Table 5 Rank order (Veenman, Wisconsin teachers, Urban teachers, UW-W cooperating teachers)

No.	Problems	Veen-man	Wis	Urban	UW-W CT
V1	Classroom discipline	1.0	4.0	7.0	3.0
V2	Motivating students	2.0	7.0	10.0	1.0
V3	Dealing with individual differences	3.0	12.0	14.5	5.0
V4	Assessing students' work	4.5	15.5	17.0	9.0
V5	Relations with parents	4.5	20.0	16.0	17.0
V6	Orgainization of class work	6.5	17.0	20.0	18.0
V7	Insufficient materials and supplies	6.5	6.0	6.0	20.0
V8	Dealing with problems of individual students	8.0	8.0	8.0	9.0
V9	Heavy teaching load resulting in insufficient prep. time	9.0	3.0	3.0	13.0
V10	Relations with colleagues	10.0	21.5	23.5	11.5
V11	Planning of lessons and schooldays	11.0	15.5	13.0	2.0
V12	Effective use of different teaching methods	12.0	18.5	19.0	15.0
V13	Awareness of school policies and rules	13.0	14.0	22.0	11.5
V14	Determining learning level of students	14.0	13.0	14.5	23.0
V15	Knowledge of subject matter	16.0	21.5	23.5	14.0
V16	Burden of clerical work	16.0	2.0	2.0	4.0
V17	Relations with principals/administrators	16.0	24.0	21.0	21.0
V18	Inadequate school equipment	18.0	9.0	5.0	6.0
V19	Dealing with slow learners	19.0	10.0	9.0	24.0
V20	Dealing with students of different cutures and deprived backgrounds	20.0	23.0	18.0	19.0
V21	Effective use of textbooks and curriculum guides	21.0	11.0	12.0	22.0
V22	Lack of spare time	22.0	1.0	1.0	7.0
V23	Inadequate guidance and support	23.0	18.5	11.0	16.0
V24	Large class size	24.0	5.0	4.0	9.0

Table 6 Rank Order Correlation

	Veenman	Wisconsin teachers	Urban teachers
Wisconsin teachers	0.040	--	--
Urban teachers	-0.164	0.895	--
UW-W cooperating teachers	0.331	0.431	0.336

Table 7 Wisconsin Teachers by Type

No.		Problems	Veenman Rank	Regular education Rank	N	Mean	SD	Special education Rank	N	Mean	SD
V1		Classroom discipline	1.0	4.5	156	2.04	0.83	7.0	28	1.82	0.67
V2		Motivating students	2.0	7.5	156	1.92	0.81	4.0	29	1.93	1.03
V3		Dealing with indiv diff	3.0	12.0	154	1.75	0.73	14.5	29	1.59	0.73
V4		Assessing students' work	4.5	15.0	156	1.63	0.72	17.5	29	1.48	0.63
V5		Relations with parents	4.5	20.0	157	1.48	0.71	22.0	29	1.28	0.45
V6		Organization of class work	6.5	16.0	157	1.59	0.69	14.5	29	1.59	0.63
V7		Insufficient materials & supplies	6.5	6.0	156	2.03	0.90	6.0	29	1.83	0.85
V8		Dealing w/ probs ind students	8.0	9.0	156	1.90	0.78	5.0	29	1.90	0.72
V9	**	Teaching load, insuff prep time	9.0	3.0	157	2.14	1.00	2.0	29	2.97	0.98
V10		Relations with colleagues	10.0	22.0	157	1.29	0.58	16.0	29	1.55	0.78
V11		Planning of lessons & schooldays	11.0	17.0	156	1.57	0.76	10.0	29	1.79	0.77
V12		Effective use of diff tch methods	12.0	18.0	157	1.55	0.61	19.5	29	1.45	0.57
V13		Awareness of sch policies & rules	13.0	14.0	157	1.66	0.70	10.0	29	1.79	0.77
V14	*	Determining learning level of stu	14.0	11.0	157	1.76	0.69	17.5	29	1.48	0.57
V15		Knowledge of subject matter	16.0	21.0	157	1.32	0.56	21.0	29	1.41	0.68
V16	**	Burden of clerical work	16.0	2.0	157	2.26	1.03	3.0	29	2.86	0.83
V17		Relations with principals/admin	16.0	23.0	156	1.27	0.59	23.5	29	1.17	0.60
V18		Inadequate school equipment	18.0	7.5	157	1.92	0.82	13.0	29	1.66	0.90
V19	*	Dealing w/slow learners	19.0	10.0	156	1.81	0.75	19.5	29	1.45	0.69
V20		Deal w/stu diff cult, deprvd bcgd	20.0	24.0	157	1.24	0.56	23.5	29	1.17	0.47
V21		Effective use txtbks, curr guides	21.0	13.0	156	1.73	0.81	10.0	29	1.79	0.82
V22	**	Lack of spare time	22.0	1.0	156	2.54	1.02	1.0	29	3.10	1.01
V23		Inadequate guidance & support	23.0	19.0	156	1.49	0.75	10.0	29	1.79	0.73
V24		Large class size	24.0	4.5	157	2.04	0.91	10.0	28	1.79	0.79
GM		Grand mean V1 to V24			157	1.75	0.38		29	1.78	0.30

* p <05 ** p <01

Table 8 Wisconsin Teachers by Level

No.		Problems	Veenman Rank	Elementary Rank	N	Mean	SD	Middle/High School Rank	N	Mean	SD
V1		Classroom discipline	1.0	6.0	67	1.96	0.77	5.5	108	2.05	0.84
V2	**	Motivating students	2.0	17.0	67	1.67	0.61	4.0	108	2.10	0.93
V3		Dealing with indiv diff	3.0	9.0	66	1.86	0.88	14.0	107	1.68	0.64
V4		Assessing students' work	4.5	11.0	67	1.72	0.83	17.0	108	1.56	0.62
V5		Relations with parents	4.5	19.5	68	1.50	0.74	20.0	108	1.44	0.65
V6		Organization of class work	6.5	16.0	68	1.68	0.70	18.0	108	1.55	0.65
V7		Insufficient materials & supplies	6.5	7.0	67	1.94	0.81	5.5	108	2.05	0.94
V8		Dealing w/ probs ind students	8.0	4.0	67	2.01	0.79	9.0	108	1.89	0.75
V9		Teaching load, insuff prep time	9.0	2.0	68	2.41	0.93	3.0	108	2.13	1.09
V10		Relations with colleagues	10.0	21.0	68	1.41	0.72	22.5	108	1.30	0.57
V11		Planning of lessons & schooldays	11.0	14.5	67	1.69	0.80	15.0	108	1.59	0.76
V12		Effective use of diff tch methods	12.0	19.5	68	1.50	0.59	16.0	108	1.57	0.61
V13		Awareness of sch policies & rules	13.0	11.0	68	1.72	0.73	13.0	108	1.69	0.71
V14		Determining learning level of stu	14.0	11.0	68	1.72	0.75	11.0	108	1.73	0.64
V15		Knowledge of subject matter	16.0	22.0	68	1.40	0.63	21.0	108	1.31	0.56
V16		Burden of clerical work	16.0	3.0	68	2.37	1.09	2.0	108	2.34	0.96
V17		Relations with principals/admin	16.0	24.0	67	1.18	0.60	22.5	108	1.30	0.60
V18	*	Inadequate school equipment	18.0	14.5	68	1.69	0.72	8.0	108	2.00	0.86
V19		Dealing w/slow learners	19.0	8.0	67	1.88	0.77	12.0	108	1.71	0.74
V20		Deal w/stu diff cult, deprvd bcgd	20.0	23.0	68	1.28	0.67	24.0	108	1.20	0.47
V21		Effective use txtbks, curr guides	21.0	13.0	67	1.70	0.74	10.0	108	1.80	0.86
V22	*	Lack of spare time	22.0	1.0	67	2.84	0.95	1.0	108	2.52	1.06
V23		Inadequate guidance & support	23.0	18.0	67	1.66	0.84	19.0	108	1.47	0.69
V24		Large class size	24.0	5.0	68	2.00	0.93	7.0	108	2.03	0.88
GM		Grand mean V1 to V24			68	1.78	0.40		108	1.75	0.36

* p <05 ** p <01

Table 9 Urban Teachers by Type

No.		Problems	Veenman Rank	Regular education Rank	N	Mean	SD	Special education Rank	N	Mean	SD
V1		Classroom discipline	1.0	8.0	110	2.07	0.94	8.5	14	2.00	0.88
V2		Motivating students	2.0	10.0	110	2.00	0.90	5.0	14	2.21	0.80
V3		Dealing with indiv diff	3.0	15.0	110	1.75	0.83	14.5	14	1.71	0.83
V4	*	Assessing students' work	4.5	16.0	110	1.68	0.78	24.0	14	1.21	0.43
V5		Relations with parents	4.5	17.0	110	1.63	0.66	17.5	14	1.64	0.74
V6		Organization of class work	6.5	21.0	110	1.53	0.66	17.5	14	1.64	0.63
V7		Insufficient materials & supplies	6.5	6.0	109	2.23	1.04	4.0	14	2.29	1.27
V8		Dealing w/ probs ind students	8.0	9.0	109	2.06	0.84	8.5	14	2.00	0.78
V9		Teaching load, insuff prep time	9.0	3.0	110	2.60	1.02	7.0	14	2.07	0.92
V10		Relations with colleagues	10.0	24.0	110	1.32	0.56	12.5	14	1.79	1.05
V11		Planning of lessons & schooldays	11.0	13.5	108	1.78	0.82	12.5	14	1.79	0.58
V12		Effective use of diff tch methods	12.0	22.0	110	1.41	0.64	17.5	14	1.64	0.74
V13		Awareness of sch policies & rules	13.0	13.5	110	1.78	0.78	21.0	14	1.43	0.65
V14		Determining learning level of stu	14.0	19.5	109	1.54	0.60	21.0	14	1.43	0.65
V15		Knowledge of subject matter	16.0	23.0	110	1.33	0.62	14.5	14	1.71	0.61
V16		Burden of clerical work	16.0	2.0	110	2.87	0.95	1.0	14	3.29	0.83
V17		Relations with principals/admin	16.0	19.5	110	1.54	0.76	23.0	14	1.29	0.61
V18		Inadequate school equipment	18.0	5.0	110	2.30	0.96	11.0	14	1.86	1.03
V19		Dealing w/slow learners	19.0	7.0	110	2.10	0.86	17.5	14	1.64	0.93
V20		Deal w/stu diff cult, deprvd bcgd	20.0	18.0	110	1.57	0.77	21.0	14	1.43	0.65
V21		Effective use txtbks, curr guides	21.0	12.0	110	1.92	0.95	3.0	13	2.31	1.18
V22		Lack of spare time	22.0	1.0	110	3.18	0.98	2.0	14	3.00	0.96
V23		Inadequate guidance & support	23.0	11.0	110	1.99	0.91	6.0	14	2.14	1.17
V24		Large class size	24.0	4.0	110	2.52	1.09	10.0	14	1.93	1.00
GM		Grand mean V1 to V24			110	1.95	0.44		14	1.89	0.32

* p <05

Table 10 Urban Teachers by Level

No.		Problems	Veenman Rank	Elementary Rank	N	Mean	SD	Middle/High School Rank	N	Mean	SD
V1	*	Classroom discipline	1.0	11.0	66	1.88	0.85	8.0	57	2.30	0.96
V2	**	Motivating students	2.0	12.0	66	1.74	0.83	5.0	57	2.35	0.86
V3		Dealing with indiv diff	3.0	13.0	66	1.68	0.81	15.0	57	1.82	0.85
V4		Assessing students' work	4.5	14.0	66	1.65	0.75	18.5	57	1.61	0.77
V5		Relations with parents	4.5	17.0	66	1.56	0.64	16.0	57	1.72	0.70
V6		Organization of class work	6.5	18.5	66	1.52	0.68	20.5	57	1.58	0.63
V7		Insufficient materials & supplies	6.5	6.0	66	2.17	0.97	6.0	56	2.34	1.16
V8		Dealing w/ probs ind students	8.0	8.0	65	1.97	0.77	10.0	57	2.18	0.89
V9		Teaching load, insuff prep time	9.0	3.0	66	2.48	0.96	4.0	57	2.63	1.08
V10		Relations with colleagues	10.0	23.5	66	1.35	0.64	23.0	57	1.40	0.65
V11	**	Planning of lessons & schooldays	11.0	15.0	65	1.60	0.68	12.5	56	2.00	0.87
V12		Effective use of diff tch methods	12.0	20.0	66	1.48	0.66	17.0	57	1.65	0.55
V13		Awareness of sch policies & rules	13.0	22.0	66	1.41	0.63	22.0	57	1.42	0.65
V14	*	Determining learning level of stu	14.0	16.0	66	1.59	0.72	14.0	57	1.91	0.81
V15		Knowledge of subject matter	16.0	23.5	66	1.35	0.57	24.0	57	1.39	0.70
V16		Burden of clerical work	16.0	2.0	66	3.00	0.91	2.0	57	2.84	0.98
V17		Relations with principals/admin	16.0	21.0	66	1.45	0.75	20.5	57	1.58	0.75
V18		Inadequate school equipment	18.0	5.0	66	2.21	0.92	7.0	57	2.32	1.04
V19		Dealing w/slow learners	19.0	9.5	66	1.94	0.80	9.0	57	2.19	0.93
V20		Deal w/stu diff cult, deprvd bcgd	20.0	18.5	66	1.52	0.75	18.5	57	1.61	0.77
V21		Effective use txtbks, curr guides	21.0	9.5	65	1.94	1.01	12.5	57	2.00	0.94
V22		Lack of spare time	22.0	1.0	66	3.11	0.95	1.0	57	3.26	0.97
V23		Inadequate guidance & support	23.0	7.0	66	2.02	0.90	11.0	57	2.02	0.99
V24	**	Large class size	24.0	4.0	66	2.23	1.05	3.0	57	2.74	1.08
GM		Grand mean V1 to V24			66	1.87	038		57	2.04	0.46

* p <05 ** p <01